

## **Guidelines for submitting proposals to the Invasive Species Mitigation Fund (ISMF)**

A Request for Proposals for projects to be funded by the ISMF is open from May 15, 2008 until July 1, 2008. Project review will be completed by the Utah Conservation Commission by July 21, 2008 and project selection by August 1, 2008.

Applications should be sent to: Margaret E. Grochocki  
c/o Utah Department of Agriculture and Food  
P.O. Box 146500  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-6500

If you have any questions, contact: Kathleen Clarke  
801-538-4916

Proposals will not be considered unless the following conditions are met:

1. All applicable permits, processes, and clearances (NEPA, Archeological, and T&E, etc clearances as required) are in place so the project can be implemented within 1 year,
2. Applicants have demonstrated that they are ready, willing, and able to implement the project,
3. Federal landowner applicants must have matching funds equal to or greater than the grant requested committed for projects on federal land.
4. A GIS shapefile of the project area showing the location of all planned treatments and the entire planning area (electronic medium).

Projects will be considered that will limit the size, severity, and frequency of wildland fire through vegetation manipulation in a watershed that is either impacted by invasive species (*e.g.* cheatgrass) and/or has a fuel load that may contribute to a catastrophic wildland fire. Project will be evaluated based on (A) size, (B) cost, and (C) quality.

### **A – Project Size**

Total acres affected by the project (project area). This should include all acres where risks of large fires will be reduced by installing practices such as fire breaks, fuel breaks, etc. and should take into account natural fire breaks, prevailing winds, fire history of the area, and expert opinion from specialists in wildland fire suppression.

## B – Project Costs

A budget for the project detailing implementation, time schedule, and monitoring, costs including contributions from other sources (committed), and the total amount being requested from ISMF.

## C – Factors for evaluating project proposals (per the legislation, SB 89 – 2008)\*

.....consider the effectiveness of a project in preventing:

- (a) first, the risk to public safety and health from:
  - (i) air pollution;
  - (ii) flooding; and
  - (iii) reduced visibility on a highway;
- (b) second, damage to the environment, including:
  - (i) soil erosion;
  - (ii) degraded water quality; and
  - (iii) release of carbon; and
- (c) third, damage to:
  - (i) a local economy; and
  - (ii) habitat for wildlife or livestock.

| Factors for Rating Project Quality |   | Scale of<br>Importance<br>From 1 to 100 |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1.                                 | Total percentage of project area that <b><u>is not</u></b> currently dominated by invasive species.   | 100                                     |
| 2.                                 | Total percentage of project area that <b><u>is</u></b> currently dominated by invasive species.   | 95                                      |
| 3.                                 | Total percentage of project area that is currently dominated by invasive species <b><u>and</u></b> will be rehabilitated or restored to a community that is dominated by non-invasive plants.   | 80                                      |
| 4.                                 | The predominant fire risk zone of the project area. For information, contact Forestry, Fire and State Land or the BLM.  | 97                                      |
| 5.                                 | The predominant ecological zone of the project area (i.e. desert, semi-desert, upland, mountain, high mountain). This can be found by determining which ecological sites are correlated to the soils in the project area, found here: <a href="http://www.ut.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/technology/range/ecosites.html">http://www.ut.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/technology/range/ecosites.html</a> and here: <a href="http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/">http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/</a> | 95                                      |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 6.  | The distance in miles from the project area to the nearest major highway (state or federal) and/or at-risk utility corridor, and the prevailing wind direction.   | 90 |
| 7.  | The distance in miles from the project area to the nearest population center and the prevailing wind direction.   | 87 |
| 8.  | The distance in miles to the nearest identified community at risk. For information, contact Forestry, Fire and State Land or the BLM.   | 87 |
| 9.  | Total Percentage of the Project area that is used for livestock grazing.  | 80 |
| 10. | Whether or not the project area overlaps any portion of a Utah PCD Conservation Focus Area. The Utah PCD Conservation Focus Area map data can be found here:<br><a href="http://dwrcdc.nr.utah.gov/ucdc/downloadgis/Data/Abiotic/WRI_FocusAreas_20080324.zip">http://dwrcdc.nr.utah.gov/ucdc/downloadgis/Data/Abiotic/WRI_FocusAreas_20080324.zip</a>                 | 75 |
| 11. | The proportion of any TMDL watershed that may be coincident with the project area. TMDL watershed map data may be found here: <a href="http://www.waterquality.utah.gov/TMDL/index.htm">http://www.waterquality.utah.gov/TMDL/index.htm</a>   | 70 |
| 12. | The predominant fuel type (vegetation that will burn in the event of a wildfire) in the project area.   | 65 |
| 13. | The weighted average or predominant erodability (k factor) of the soils in the project area. This can be found in the soil survey located here: <a href="http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/">http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/</a> If there is no soil survey for the project area, describing the predominant surface textures of the soils will suffice. | 65 |
| 14. | Proportion of the project area that includes landslide potential according to UGS data available here:<br><a href="http://gis.utah.gov/index.php?option=com_dbquery&amp;Itemid=87">http://gis.utah.gov/index.php?option=com_dbquery&amp;Itemid=87</a>   | 63 |
| 15. | Whether the project is adjacent to, and enhances the effect of, an area where a fuel mitigation project has been completed within the past 5 years and a brief description of that project.   | 60 |

\*The factors and scale of weighted importance are intended only to guide the project quality evaluation process. Other factors may be considered in final project selection.